DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 130 HE 009 664

AUTHOR Mueller, Daniel J.; Keene, John M., Jr.
TITLE A Follow-Up Study of Groups Program Students, 1969 to 1975.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Bureau of Educational Studies and Testing.
PUB DATE Dec 77
NOTE 40p.; Not available in paper copy; some parts of document may not reproduce clearly
AVAILABLE FROM Indiana University, Division of Research and Development, Bureau of Evaluative Studies and Testing, Bloomington, Indiana 47401

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Freshmen; *Educational Status Comparison; *Employment Patterns; *Followup Studies; Higher Education; Institutional Research; Loan Repayment; Research Projects; *School Surveys; *Special Programs; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; Student Financial Aid; *Student Loan Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Indiana University

ABSTRACT

In the spring semester of 1977 all Indiana University Groups Program students from the freshman classes 1969 through 1975 were surveyed by mailed questionnaires. Responses were received from 177 of the 1,437 Groups students to whom they were sent. Respondents were asked about educational status and educational history, current employment, and financial aid received while in the program. The major portion of the questionnaire, however, asked respondents about their use of program facilities and services, and their evaluations of these facilities and services. Most respondents were well pleased with the Groups Program staff. The most criticized program element was financial aid - especially the loan program, which many students and families dealt with the selection and identification of Groups students and counseling directed at early clarification of student goals. (Author/SPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

A Follow-Up Study of Groups Program Students 1969 to 1975

INDIANA STUDIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

NUMBER THIRTY-FIVE

Bureau of Evaluative Studies and Testing
INDIANA UNIVERSITY 1977

LB2331.4
.G6 I4

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF GROUPS PROGRAM STUDENTS 1969 TO 1975

DANIEL J. MUELLER

JOHN M. KEENE, JR.

INDIANA STUDIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION
NUMBER THIRTY-FIVE

BUREAU OF EVALUATIVE STUDIES AND TESTING
DIVISION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
INDIANA UNIVERSITY
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401

DECEMBER 1977

Indiana Studies in Higher Education was formerly entitled *Indiana Studies in Prediction*.

Bureau of Evaluative Studies and Testing was formerly entitled *Bureau of Educational Studies and Testing*.

Abstract

In the Spring semester of 1977 Groups students from the freshman classes 1969 through 1975 were followed-up by mailed questionnaires. Respondents were asked about educational status and educational history, current employment, and financial aid received while in the Program. The major portion of the questionnaire, however, asked respondents about their use of Program facilities and services, and their evaluations of these facilities and services.

Most respondents were well pleased with the Groups Program. Particularly praised was the sincerity and conscientiousness of the Program staff. The most criticized Program element was financial aid - especially the loan program, which many students (and families) found burdensome when it came time to pay the loans back. Other areas of comment dealt with the selection and identification of Groups students and counseling directed at early clarification of student goals.

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
The Sample	1
Educational History and Status	6
Employment	9
Housing at Indiana University	9
Selection and Orientation to Groups Program	9
Financial Aid	13
Extent of Use and Evaluative Reactions to Program Facilities and Services	15
Discussion and Conclusion	23
Appendix	27

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	SAMPLE PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION BY PROGRAM YEAR	2
2	SEX OF SAMPLE BY PROGRAM YEAR	3
3	CURRENT STUDENT STATUS BY PROGRAM YEAR	3
4	SEMESTER OR YEAR OF LEAVING I.U. BLOOMINGTON BY PROGRAM YEAR	4
5	ACADEMIC STATUS UPON LEAVING I.U. BLOOMINGTON BY PROGRAM YEAR	5
6	PERCENTAGE OF THOSE WHO LEFT I.U. BEFORE GRADUATION WHO EARNED A DEGREE ELSEWHERE BY PROGRAM YEAR	6
7	GRADUATION SCHOOL BY PROGRAM YEAR	7
8	SCHOOL ENTERED AFTER LEAVING UNIVERSITY DIVISION BY PROGRAM YEAR	7
9	EMPLOYMENT AFTER LEAVING I.U. BY PROGRAM YEAR .	8
10	RELATEDNESS OF EMPLOYMENT TO COLLEGE DEGREE FOR GRADUATES BY PROGRAM YEAR	8
11	RESIDENCE BY ACADEMIC LEVEL	10
12	PROFESSIONAL POSITION OF RECOMMENDER BY PROGRAM YEAR	10
13	CLARITY OF PURPOSES OF PROGRAM AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT BY PROGRAM YEAR	11
14	STUDENTS' UNDERSTANDING OF OBLIGATIONS TO PROGRAM AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT, BY PROGRAM YEAR	12
15	STUDENTS' UNDERSTANDING OF PROGRAM'S OBLIGATIONS AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT, BY PROGRAM YEAR	12
16	DEGREE OF PARENTAL PARTICIPATION IN AREA VISITATION PROGRAM	12
17	AMOUNT OF FINANCIAL AID, BY PROGRAM YEAR . . .	13
18	TYPE OF FINANCIAL AID BY PROGRAM YEAR	14
19	ADEQUACY OF FINANCIAL AID BY PROGRAM YEAR . . .	14
20	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF SAMPLE MEMBERS WHO TOOK SPECIAL COURSES BY COURSE AREA	16
21	RESPONDENT RATINGS OF HELPFULNESS OF SPECIAL COURSES IN PREPARATION FOR MORE ADVANCED COURSES BY PROGRAM YEAR	16
22	EXTENT OF USE OF PROGRAM SERVICES	18
23	REPORTED HELPFULNESS OF PROGRAM SERVICES . . .	18
24	EXTENT OF USE OF PERSONAL CONFERENCES WITH PROGRAM STAFF	19
25	REPORTED HELPFULNESS OF PERSONAL CONFERENCES WITH PROGRAM STAFF	19
26	FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS WITH SPECIFIED PROGRAM STAFF MEMBERS	20
27	RESPONDENT RATING OF HELPFULNESS OF MEETINGS WITH SPECIFIED PROGRAM STAFF MEMBERS	20

Introduction

In the Spring semester of 1977 a follow-up study was conducted of all Groups Program students, from the inception of the program in 1969 through those entering the Freshman class of 1975. The program averages slightly over 200 students per year. The total population size for the seven years studied is 1,48 An initial set of addresses was obtained from the Groups Program. Since some of these were as many as six years old a second set of addresses was obtained from the Indiana Bureau of Motor Vehicles. These addresses were available for all Groups members holding valid Indiana driver's licenses. For those Groups students who were currently enrolled at I.U., campus addresses were obtained from University records.

Usable addresses were obtained for a total of 1,437 Groups students. Questionnaires were sent by campus mail to 208 Groups Program members with campus addresses, and by First Class mail to the remaining 1,229 sample members. Most of these 1,229 are not currently enrolled. A self-addressed, stamped, return envelope accompanied each questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire, and of the accompanying cover letter, is found in the Appendix. Three weeks after the questionnaires were mailed a follow-up post card was sent to non-respondents.

In addition to demographic data, the questionnaire contains questions about educational status and history, employment, and financial aid received while in the Program. The majo portion of the questionnaire, however, contains questions about the extent of use of Program facilities and services, and reactions to and evaluations of specific program components.

The Sample

As shown in Table 1, complete and usable questionnaires were received from 177 of the 1,437 Groups students to whom they were sent. Thus the survey had a questionnaire return rate of less than 13% (12.3%), making generalization to the population extremely tenuous.

TABLE 1

SAMPLE PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION
BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	*Sample Size*	*Population Size*	*Sample % of Population*
1969	24	192	12.5
1970	18	200	9.0
1971	26	193	13.5
1972	16	196	8.2
1973	21	211	10.0
1974	30	233	12.9
1975	42	255	16.5
Total	177	1480	12.0

Further, the sample is biased in some known ways: 1) Sixty-one percent of the sample members are female (Table 2). The population has 55.4% females. 2) The questionnaire return rate from campus mailed questionnaires was 25 percent; the respective figure from questionnaires sent by First Class U.S. mail was 10.1 percent. Since campus mail addresses are current, and many home addresses are old and doubtless incorrect (slightly under 200 questionnaires were returned undelivered due to wrong addresses), this disproportionate return rate is not surprising. Furthermore, the two most recent sample years, 1974 and 1975, had the largest population sizes (Table 1). Most currently enrolled students are from these Program year groups. 3) Of those sample members who began in the program long enough ago to have graduated (1969 through 1972 Program years) nearly 40 percent graduated from I.U. The comparable population statistic is 23 percent. (It should be noted that the percentage of all 1969 through 1972 Groups students who earned baccalaureate degrees was slightly higher than 23%. The percentage who graduated from colleges other than I.U. is not known.) The sample thus contains disproportionally high percentages of females, graduates, and recent (and current) Groups Program students.

TABLE 2

SEX OF SAMPLE BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	*Male* N	%	*Female* N	%	*Total* N
1969	13	54.2	11	45.8	24
1970	6	37.5	10	62.5	16*
1971	8	33.3	16	66.7	24*
1972	3	18.8	13	81.3	16
1973	7	33.3	14	66.7	21
1974	10	33.3	20	66.7	30
1975	20	47.6	22	52.4	42
Total	67	38.7	106	61.3	173

*Note: Two people in both the 1970 and 1971 class did not report sex.

TABLE 3

CURRENT STUDENT STATUS
BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	*Currently a Student* N	%	*Currently not a Student* N	%	*Total* N
1969	1	4.2	23	95.8	24
1970	1	5.9	16	94.1	17
1971	3	11.5	23	88.5	26
1972	5	31.2	11	68.8	16
1973	11	52.4	10	47.6	21
1974	13	43.3	17	56.7	30
1975	34	81.0	8	19.0	42
Total	68	38.6	108	61.4	176

*Note: One person in 1970 class did not report student status.

Table 4

Semester or Year of Leaving I.U. Bloomington by Program Year

Program Year	After Initial Summer Session		After First Semester		After Freshman Year		After Sophomore Year		After Junior Year		After Senior Year		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1969	2	9.5	0	0.0	3	14.3	4	19.0	1	4.8	11	52.4	21
1970	1	5.9	3	17.0	5	29.4	1	5.9	2	11.8	4	29.4	17
1971	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	19.2	6	23.1	3	11.5	12	46.2	26
1972	1	7.1	1	7.1	3	21.4	5	35.7	0	0.0	4	28.6	14
1973	1	9.1	0	0.0	2	18.2	4	36.4	3	27.3	1	9.1	11
1974	2	11.1	4	22.2	9	50.0	3	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	18
1975	2	18.2	1	9.1	6	54.5	2	18.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	11
Total	9	7.6	9	7.6	33	28.0	25	21.2	9	7.6	33	28.0	118*

*From Table 3, only 108 are no longer enrolled, 10 have apparently reenrolled after dropping out.

TABLE 5

ACADEMIC STATUS UPON LEAVING I.U. BLOOMINGTON BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	*Transferred to Regional Campus*		*Transferred to Another College*		*Graduated*		*Left College Altogether*		*Total*
	N	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*
1969	5	22.7	1	4.5	11	50.0	5	22.7	22
1970	0	0.0	3	21.4	6	42.9	5	35.7	14
1971	2	8.0	3	12.0	13	52.0	7	28.0	25
1972	6	46.2	0	0.0	2	15.4	5	38.5	13
1973	6	46.2	1	7.7	3	23.1	3	23.1	13
1974	5	29.4	2	11.8	0	0.0	10	58.8	17
1975	5	50.0	2	20.0	0	0.0	3	30.0	10
Total	29	25.4	12	10.5	35	30.7	38	33.3	114

Educational History and Status

Tables 3 through 8 present data from questions dealing with educational history and educational status. Table 3 indicates that 38.6% of the sample members are currently enrolled at I.U. As expected, the percentages are highest in most recent Program years. The 10 students from the 1969 through 1972 Program years who report that they are currently enrolled are either graduate students, or have returned after dropping out.

Table 4 reports the semester or year after which Groups students discontinued their enrollment at I.U. Bloomington. A total of 49.2% of sample members left I.U. Bloomington after either their Freshman or Sophomore year. It should be noted that not all who left I.U. dropped out of college; some transferred to other colleges (Table 5). Table 6 indicates that nearly 12% of those sample members who left I.U. before graduation earned a degree elsewhere.

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE OF THOSE WHO LEFT I.U. BEFORE GRADUATION WHO EARNED A DEGREE ELSEWHERE BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	*Earned Degree Elsewhere*		*Did Not Earn A Degree Elsewhere*		*Total*
	N	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*
1969	1	9.1	10	90.9	11
1970	1	12.5	7	87.5	8
1971	1	8.3	11	91.7	12
1972	2	18.2	9	81.8	11
Total	5	11.9	37	88.1	42

Ten sample members reported having received a graduate degree. Of these ten, 4 were reportedly in law; 6 received masters degrees in arts and science (no table).

In Table 7 the Schools of the 45 graduates can be seen. The two primary Schools in which Groups graduates majored were Arts and Sciences (42.2%) and Education (28.9%). Table 8

TABLE 7

GRADUATION SCHOOL BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	Arts & Sciences N	%	Education N	%	HPER N	%	Music N	%	Business N	%	Other N	%	Total N
1969	7	46.7	6	40.0	0	0.0	1	6.6	1	6.6	0	0.0	15
1970	6	60.0	3	30.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	10
1971	2	16.6	3	25.0	1	8.3	1	8.3	4	33.3	1	8.3	12
1972	4	50.0	1	12.5	1	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	25.0	8
Total	19	42.2	13	28.9	3	6.7	2	4.4	5	11.1	3	6.7	45

TABLE 8

SCHOOL ENTERED AFTER LEAVING UNIVERSITY DIVISION BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	Arts & Sciences N	%	Education N	%	HPER N	%	Music N	%	Business N	%	Other N	%	Total N
1969	5	25.0	11	55.0	0	0.0	1	5.0	3	15.0	0	0.0	20
1970	7	63.6	1	9.1	1	9.1	0	0.0	2	18.2	0	0.0	11
1971	3	15.8	6	31.6	3	15.8	1	5.3	5	26.3	1	5.3	19
1972	3	30.0	4	40.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	20.0	10
1973	7	41.2	2	11.8	1	5.9	0	0.0	3	17.6	4	23.5	17
1974	6	46.2	2	15.4	2	15.4	0	0.0	2	15.4	1	7.7	13
1975	12	50.0	2	8.3	1	4.2	0	0.0	5	20.8	4	16.7	24
Total	43	37.7	28	24.6	9	7.9	2	1.7	20	17.5	12	10.5	114

8

TABLE 9

EMPLOYMENT AFTER LEAVING I.U. BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	*Employed*		*Not Employed*		*Total*
	N	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*
1969	19	95.0	1	5.0	20
1970	12	85.7	2	14.3	14
1971	17	80.9	4	19.1	21
1972	9	90.0	1	10.0	10
1973	5	62.5	3	37.5	8
1974	14	82.3	3	17.7	17
1975	0	0.0	3	100.0	3
Total	76	81.7	17	18.3	93

TABLE 10

RELATEDNESS OF EMPLOYMENT TO COLLEGE DEGREE FOR GRADUATES BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	*Related*		*Not Related*		*Total*
	N	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*
1969	8	72.7	3	27.3	11
1970	3	60.0	2	40.0	5
1971	6	46.2	7	53.8	13
1972	2	50.0	2	50.0	4
Total	19	57.6	14	42.4	33

indicates the majors of sample members when they transferred out of the University Division; again Arts and Science and Education contain the largest proportions of respondents with 37.7% and 24.6% respectively.

Employment

Table 9 indicates that 81.7% of those sample members who left college (including both graduates and dropouts) are currently employed. For the Program years 1969 through 1972 the figure is nearly 87%. Of the employed graduates from Program years 1969 through 1972, 57.6% report that they are employed in a job related to their degree program (Table 10).

Housing at Indiana University

In Table 11 the type of housing in which sample members resided during each of their Program years can be seen. Sample members from all Program years are combined in this table. Since it is a Program mandate, it is no surprise that 100% of all freshmen resided in University dormitories. As they advance in class standing more and more Groups students move to apartments or rented houses. As seniors 50.8% of all sample members reported living in apartments or rented houses. A relatively small percentage of sample members reside or resided in fraternity or sorority houses. Of the 20 sample members who were or are graduate students two-thirds live(d) in dormitories; one-third in apartments or rented houses.

Selection and Orientation to Groups Program

The professional position of recommenders of all respondents is seen in Table 12. Nearly 70% of all respondents were recommended by high school counselors. Upward-Bound workers accounted for another 10.4% of the total, and high school teachers for 9.2%. The remaining 11% of respondents were recommended by principals, vice-principals, community project workers, or social workers.

Table 13 records how clear the purposes of the Group Program reportedly were to the sample members at the time of their enrollment. Fifty-six percent of the sample members reported

TABLE 11

RESIDENCE BY ACADEMIC LEVEL

Academic Level	Dormitory N	Dormitory %	Fraternity or Sorority N	Fraternity or Sorority %	Apartment or Rented House N	Apartment or Rented House %	Home of Relatives or Friends N	Home of Relatives or Friends %	Total N
Freshman	168	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	168
Sophomore	107	81.2	9	6.9	14	10.7	1	0.8	131
Junior	40	50.6	8	10.1	31	39.2	0	0.0	79
Senior	24	42.1	4	7.0	29	50.8	0	0.0	57
Graduate	13	65.0	0	0.0	7	35.0	0	0.0	20

TABLE 12

PROFESSIONAL POSITION OF RECOMMENDER BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	H.S. Teacher N	H.S. Teacher %	H.S. Counselor N	H.S. Counselor %	H.S. Principal or Vice-Principal N	H.S. Principal or Vice-Principal %	Community Project Worker N	Community Project Worker %	Social Worker N	Social Worker %	Upward Bound Worker N	Upward Bound Worker %	Total N
1969	3	15.0	12	60.0	0	0.0	2	10.0	2	10.0	1	5.0	20
1970	2	12.5	10	62.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	12.5	2	12.5	16
1971	5	21.7	14	60.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	13.0	1	4.3	23
1972	1	7.1	11	78.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.1	1	7.1	14
1973	0	0.0	13	61.9	1	4.8	2	9.5	1	4.8	4	19.0	21
1974	0	0.0	23	82.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	4	14.3	28
1975	4	9.8	30	73.2	1	2.4	1	2.4	1	2.4	4	9.8	41
Total	15	9.2	113	69.3	2	1.2	5	3.1	11	6.7	17	10.4	163

TABLE 13

CLARITY OF PURPOSES OF PROGRAM AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	Very Clear N	Very Clear %	Not too Clear N	Not too Clear %	Unclear N	Unclear %	Total N
1969	10	45.4	5	22.7	7	31.8	22
1970	6	35.3	8	47.1	3	17.6	17
1971	16	66.7	4	16.7	4	16.7	24
1972	10	71.4	4	28.6	0	0.0	14
1973	11	52.4	9	42.9	1	4.8	21
1974	16	53.3	13	43.3	1	3.3	30
1975	26	61.9	13	31.0	3	7.1	42
Total	95	55.9	56	32.9	19	11.2	170

the Program purposes to have been "very clear," 33% reported the purposes to have been "not too clear," and 11% indicated they were "unclear."

Tables 14 and 15 deal with the clarity, respectively, of the obligations of Groups Program members to the Program and of the obligations of the Program to the members. Sample members who had a very clear understanding of their obligations to the Program made up 67.7% of the sample, while 23.3% were reportedly not too clear in understanding of their obligations, and 9.0% were unclear. Students' understanding of their obligations to the Program appears to have improved in more recent years. The students' clarity of the Program's obligations to them (Table 15) is somewhat lower than their clarity of purposes of the Program (Table 13) and their understanding of their obligations to the Program (Table 14). Only 47.3% of the respondents were very clear regarding the Program's obligations to them; 35.7% were not too clear, and 17% were unclear.

In Table 16 the extent of parental participation in the Area Visitation Program can be seen. In 60.4% of the cases only the mother attended while in 23.5% both parents were present.

TABLE 14

STUDENTS' UNDERSTANDING OF OBLIGATIONS TO PROGRAM AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT, BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	Very Clear N	Very Clear %	Not too Clear N	Not too Clear %	Unclear N	Unclear %	Total N
1969	7	33.3	6	28.6	8	38.1	21
1970	9	60.0	4	26.7	2	13.3	15
1971	14	58.3	9	37.5	1	4.2	24
1972	12	80.0	3	20.0	0	0.0	15
1973	16	80.0	2	10.0	2	10.0	20
1974	21	70.0	7	23.3	2	6.7	30
1975	34	81.0	8	19.0	0	0.0	42
Total	113	67.7	39	23.3	15	9.0	167

TABLE 15

STUDENTS' UNDERSTANDING OF PROGRAM'S OBLIGATIONS AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT, BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	Very Clear N	Very Clear %	Not too Clear N	Not too Clear %	Unclear N	Unclear %	Total N
1969	7	33.3	7	33.3	7	33.3	21
1970	7	43.7	4	25.0	5	31.2	16
1971	10	43.5	12	52.2	1	4.3	23
1972	7	46.7	7	46.7	1	6.7	15
1973	15	79.0	3	15.8	1	5.3	19
1974	12	41.4	15	51.7	2	7.0	29
1975	20	47.6	11	26.2	11	26.2	42
Total	78	47.3	59	35.7	28	17.0	165

TABLE 16

DEGREE OF PARENTAL PARTICIPATION IN AREA VISITATION PROGRAM

	N	%
Mother Only	90	60.4
Father Only	11	7.4
Both Parents	35	23.5
Other Relative	8	5.4
Guardian	5	3.4
Total	149	100.0

Financial Aid

The amount, kind, and reported adequacy of financial aid can be seen in Tables 17, 18 and 19. In Table 17 the amount of financial aid given to students was characterized by full, partial, or none. For all Program years combined, 55.3% of respondents received full aid, 42.9% received partial aid, and 1.8% received no financial aid. An increasing trend can be seen in the amount of full financial aid received by respondents over the years: in 1969 only 43.5% reportedly received full financial aid, while in 1975, 64.3% received full aid.

TABLE 17

AMOUNT OF FINANCIAL AID, BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	*Full Aid*		*Partial Aid*		*No Aid*		*Total*
	N	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*
1969	10	43.5	13	56.5	0	0.0	23
1970	8	50.0	8	50.0	0	0.0	16
1971	12	50.0	11	45.8	1	4.2	24
1972	8	47.1	6	42.9	0	0.0	14
1973	13	61.9	7	33.3	1	4.8	21
1974	16	53.3	14	46.7	0	0.0	30
1975	27	64.3	14	33.3	1	2.4	42
Total	94	55.3	73	42.9	3	1.8	170

Table 18 describes the kind of financial aid received by respondents according to their Program year. The four types of financial aid are: loans, grants, scholarships, and work study. In the total sample, 90.4% of the respondents received loans, 90.9% received grants, 50.3% received scholarships, and 33.3% received work study aid.

When asked if the amount of financial aid was adequate to their needs 66.1% of total respondents said it was (Table 19). The data show that those in Program years 1969 through 1972 found the aid less adequate than those in Program years 1973 through 1975.

A substantial number of respondents commented negatively about financial aid. In addition to complaints about in-

TABLE 18

TYPE OF FINANCIAL AID BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	Loans N	Loans %	Grants N	Grants %	Scholarships N	Scholarships %	Work Study N	Work Study %	Total N
1969	22	91.7	22	91.7	20	83.3	10	41.6	24
1970	16	88.9	15	83.3	8	44.4	7	38.9	18
1971	23	88.5	22	84.6	16	61.5	9	34.6	26
1972	13	81.3	14	87.5	11	68.7	5	31.2	16
1973	20	95.2	20	95.2	9	42.8	7	33.3	21
1974	27	90.0	28	93.3	10	33.3	8	26.7	30
1975	40	95.2	40	95.2	15	35.7	13	30.0	42
Total	160	90.4	161	90.9	89	50.3	59	33.3	177

TABLE 19

ADEQUACY OF FINANCIAL AID BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	Adequate N	Adequate %	Not Adequate N	Not Adequate %	Total N
1969	14	60.9	9	39.1	23
1970	9	52.9	8	47.1	17
1971	13	59.1	9	40.9	22
1972	7	50.0	7	50.0	14
1973	14	66.7	7	33.3	21
1974	21	70.0	9	30.0	30
1975	33	80.5	8	19.5	41
Total	111	66.1	57	33.9	168

sufficient financial aid, many respondents expressed a concern that the loans which they had taken out were too demanding when it came time to pay them back. Some felt that they had not fully understood (or appreciated) the extent of the financial commitment they had made. Following are representative student comments:

"I was not given enough financial aid to cover my educational needs."

"I found that financially the program was not as much of a help to me as I thought it's purpose, or shall I say one of it's purposes was. Due to this I had no alternative exept to drop out of the program until I was financially able to continue school."

*"Student loans isn't worth a good *!+%! Reason: I had only been out of school for about 1 year when I started getting hasseled for their *%!$ money."*

"The loans were quite demanding to be paid back when you finish school. Work Study would be the best Route."

"It has put too much pressure on me to repay it now."

"I did not know exactly what the loans were about. They weren't thoroughly explained to me."

"I owe too many loans trying to go to school."

"Financial assistance information should be more explicit. Explain to the student the percent or amount of interest that accumulates with a loan. Explain to him the terms that go along with a loan."

"I received entirely too much loan money. It placed a great strain on my parents."

"I was disappointed because of the many loans I had to apply for to meet my educational needs. Now I regret it because I'll be the rest of my life paying it back."

"I feel as though you misled me about the financial aid. Nevertheless, I know better now. When I go back to school it will be paid by me."

Extent of Use and Evaluative Reactions to Program Facilities and Services

Tables 20 and 21 deal with the kind and helpfulness of special courses which were taken by respondents. Special courses are non-credit courses provided by the University for students deficient in certain academic skills. In Table 20 can be seen the number and kind of special courses taken. There was no great variation over Program years so Table 20

TABLE 20

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF SAMPLE MEMBERS WHO TOOK SPECIAL COURSES BY COURSE AREA

Course Area	No Courses N	No Courses %	One Course N	One Course %	Two or More Courses N	Two or More Courses %	Total N
English	47	26.6	115	65.0	15	8.4	177
Speech	160	90.4	15	8.5	2	1.2	177
Mathematics	64	36.2	47	26.6	66	37.2	177
History	154	87.0	17	9.6	6	3.4	177
Reading and Study Skills	109	61.6	59	33.3	9	5.1	177
Political Science	160	90.4	15	8.5	2	1.2	177
Biology	146	82.5	29	16.4	2	1.1	177
Special Language Courses	140	79.1	26	14.7	11	6.2	177

TABLE 21

RESPONDENT RATINGS OF HELPFULNESS OF SPECIAL COURSES IN PREPARATION FOR MORE ADVANCED COURSES BY PROGRAM YEAR

Program Year	Not Helpful N	Not Helpful %	Somewhat Helpful N	Somewhat Helpful %	Very Helpful N	Very Helpful %	Total N
1969	10	50.0	5	25.0	5	25.0	20
1970	3	23.1	4	30.8	6	46.1	13
1971	0	0.0	12	52.2	11	47.8	23
1972	7	58.3	4	33.3	1	8.3	12
1973	1	5.0	10	50.0	9	45.0	20
1974	5	22.7	12	54.5	5	22.7	22
1975	9	24.3	23	62.2	5	13.5	37
Total	35	23.8	70	47.6	42	28.6	147

does not separate respondents by year. English and Mathematics were the areas where most respondents took special courses. In English, 65% took one special course and 8.4% took two or more; in mathematics 26.6% took one special course and 37.2% took two or more. Reading and Study Skills is the only other area where more than 25% of the respondents took special courses; 33.3% of respondents took one course and 5.1% took two or more special courses in this area.

Student comments regarding J courses were mixed. Some students reported that these courses were very helpful to them; some complimented their instructors highly. But some students who took J courses felt that they were too elementary, and others complained that some of their classmates had taken these courses for an easy grade. No clear pattern of compliments or criticisms emerged, by department or instructor. There appears to be a need for more careful placement of students into these courses, however. Representative student comments follow:

"Most (J-math courses) was a review for me, but the math classes were highly helpful for some."

"The J courses that I took were excellent. They represented the single most helpful part of the Groups Program, in my opinion."

"They were not helpful. To be perfectly honest they were just courses to take up time. I got decent grades (A or B) in both."

"The reading and study skills course taught me the proper way to study for tests. The history course really helped me prepare for the essay tests."

"The J-course I took in biology with Carol Bart helped me to get a B in the L100 course."

"The English course seemed to be too elementary."

"I found that the instructors of the special courses took time to help students as much as possible."

"The English course was extremely helpful since I hadn't had much writing in High School."

"The J-History course didn't have a great deal to do with H105, but it was extremely interesting."

"The Germlish class was a waste of time."

"The Germlish was the only one that was a big help. I really enjoyed it."

TABLE 22

EXTENT OF USE OF PROGRAM SERVICES

Program Services	*Not at All* N	%	*Once in a While* N	%	*Frequently* N	%	*Total* N
Reading and Study Skills Center	66	41.8	52	32.9	40	25.3	158
Latino Cultural Center (La Casa)	110	84.6	11	8.5	9	6.9	130
Black Culture Center	43	26.7	69	42.8	49	30.4	161
Tutorial Program of the Black Culture Center	64	40.8	62	39.5	31	19.7	157
Individual Tutoring in the Group Program Office	103	66.9	36	23.4	15	9.7	154

TABLE 23

REPORTED HELPFULNESS OF PROGRAM SERVICES

Program Services	*Not at All* N	%	*Somewhat* N	%	*Very* N	%	*Total* N
Reading and Study Skills Center	9	10.1	54	60.7	26	29.2	89
Latino Cultural Center (La Casa)	0	0.0	11	57.9	8	42.1	19
Black Cultural Center	3	2.6	61	53.0	51	44.3	115
Tutorial Program of the Black Cultural Center	6	6.7	42	46.7	42	46.7	90
Individual Tutoring in the Group Program Office	2	4.3	24	52.2	20	43.5	46

TABLE 24

EXTENT OF USE OF PERSONAL CONFERENCES WITH PROGRAM STAFF

Personal Conference Concern	*Not at All*		*Once in a While*		*Frequently*		*Total*
	N	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*
Personal or Social	59	36.4	78	48.1	25	15.4	162
Financial	70	42.9	57	35.0	36	22.1	163
Academic	54	32.7	84	50.9	27	16.4	165
Career or Vocational	85	54.1	57	36.3	15	9.5	157

TABLE 25

REPORTED HELPFULNESS OF PERSONAL CONFERENCES WITH PROGRAM STAFF

Personal Conference Concern	*Not at All*		*Somewhat*		*Very*		*Total*
	N	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*
Personal or Social	6	5.9	54	53.5	41	40.6	101
Financial	10	10.7	43	46.2	40	43.0	93
Academic	7	6.5	59	54.6	42	38.9	108
Career or Vocational	8	11.8	33	48.5	27	39.7	68

TABLE 26

FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS WITH SPECIFIED PROGRAM STAFF MEMBERS

Group Staff Member	*Seldom* N	%	*Once in a While* N	%	*Quite Frequently* N	%	*Total* N
Recommender (Before entering the Group Program)	36	22.8	39	24.7	83	52.5	158
Recommender (After entering the Group Program)	68	48.9	53	38.1	18	12.9	139
University Division Academic Advisor	39	26.7	75	51.4	32	21.9	146
Student Assistant	44	32.6	57	42.2	34	25.2	135
Residence Hall Assistant	44	29.5	62	41.6	43	28.9	149
Buddy	60	57.1	28	26.7	17	16.2	105

TABLE 27

RESPONDENT RATING OF HELPFULNESS OF MEETINGS WITH SPECIFIED PROGRAM STAFF MEMBERS

Group Staff Member	*Not at All* N	%	*Somewhat* N	%	*Very* N	%	*Total* N
Recommender (Prior to coming to I.U.)	17	11.1	49	32.0	87	56.9	153
Recommender (After coming to I.U.)	42	31.6	61	45.9	30	22.5	133
University Division Academic Advisor	41	28.3	64	44.1	40	27.6	145
Student Assistant	35	27.3	59	46.1	34	26.6	128
Residence Hall Assistant	29	20.4	62	43.7	51	35.9	142
Buddy	46	44.7	35	34.0	22	21.3	103

"English was too primary. Brody's math classes were good."

"They were helpful if you were deficient in the area. Some entered into those courses for an easy grade. It should be screened more selectively to weed out those who don't need them. With your advanced students in those types of classes, it tends to get above the intended level."

Tables 22, 24, and 26 indicate the extent to which sample members reported their use of various Program services and personnel. Tables 23, 25, and 27 indicate the degree of reported helpfulness of these services and personnel. Only the helpfulness ratings of those who used the services are included in the latter tables.

Table 22 indicates that the Reading and Study Skills Center was used "frequently" by 25.3% of respondents and "once in a while" by 32.9%. The Latino Cultural Center was not used at all by 84.6% of sample members. The Black Culture Center was used "frequently" by 30.4% of respondents, and "once in a while" by 42.8%. The Tutorial Program of the Black Culture Center was used at least some by 59.2% of respondents, and Individual Tutoring in the Groups Program Office was utilized at least some by 33.1%.

Of those who used the above services, all but the Reading and Study Skills Center were found to be "very" helpful by at least 42% of the respondents (Table 23). Over 89% of the users of these services found each at least "somewhat" helpful.

Many sample members also utilized personal conferences with Program staff members for various counseling services (Table 24). Academic, and Personal and Social conferences were most frequent, with 67.3% and 63.6%, respectively, participating in such conferences at least "once in a while." Financial counseling conferences and Career or Vocational counseling conferences were only slightly less frequent, with 57.1% and 45.8%, respectively, participating in such conferences at least "once in a while."

Table 25 indicates the reported helpfulness of these various types of personal conferences. All types were judged substantially helpful by users of these services, with at least

38% judging each type of conference "very" helpful, and more than 87% judging each type to be at least "somewhat" helpful.

Almost without exception, respondents praised the dedication, sincerity and helpfulness of Program staff members in helping them cope with both academic and personal problems. Many staff members were mentioned by name, but none received accolades as glowing or as frequently as Rozelle Boyd, Director of the Groups Program, and LaVerta Terry, Associate Director of the Program. Following are representative student comments:

"The contact I had with Groups advisors was generally superior to that which I found offered in other parts of the University."

"Dean Boyd and the entire staff always seemed to take the time to give you special assistance when one needed and asked for it."

"Mr. Prescott helped me an awful lot. He seemed to always give me the extra support and positive attitude of 'You can. Don't let anyone tell you different!'"

"Thank you Dean Boyd and Mrs. Terry for giving me the opportunity to go to IU and get a BS in Vocational Home Economics Education."

"The availability of concerned staff provided motivation and guidance for me."

"When I was homesick Dean Boyd persuaded me to stay on. I will always be thankful to him for not allowing me to give up what has become an important facet of my life. Both Dean Boyd and Mrs. Terry have been supportive and positive in their friendship with me."

"The people associated with the program were the most significant, helpful and memorable. If asked for a rank I would have to say Mrs. Terry, Mr. Ray Kuma, and Mr. Rozelle Boyd. Mr. Boyd last only because he was too busy to be seen as frequently as the others. I will forever be indebted to these people for making my college experience a fruitful and exciting experience. Thank you."

"Dean Boyd is excellent! He's direct and very outspoken. He opened a lot of noses by telling it like it is! Dean Boyd and all his staff are a great asset to the Groups Program. I send my best wishes and continued success."

Table 26 indicates the frequency of contact which sample members had with various Groups Program personnel. Not too

surprisingly, many respondents report having had frequent contact with recommenders prior to coming to I.U., but infrequent contact after coming to I.U. Frequency of meetings with University Division Academic Advisors, Student Assistants, and Residence Hall Assistants were moderate, with the most used frequency category for meetings with each of these staff members being "once in a while." Meetings with Buddies are relatively infrequent, with 83.8% of respondents reporting meeting "seldom" or "once in a while."

Meetings with recommenders, prior to coming to I.U. were judged "very" helpful by almost 60% of respondents (Table 27). Meetings with Resident Hall Assistants were also judged substantially helpful, with 79.6% of respondents rating these meetings at least "somewhat" helpful. More than a fourth of the respondents rated meetings with University Division Academic Advisors and with Student Assistants to have been "not at all" helpful. Meetings with Buddies were seen as the least helpful, with 44.7% of respondents rating these meetings "not at all" helpful.

Discussion and Conclusion

On the whole, respondents were very pleased with the Groups Program. Most indicated that the program was well conceived and well executed. With minor exceptions, program components, facilities, and staff were positively evaluated. A heartfelt sense of appreciation was communicated by a number of respondents:

> *"I liked all aspects of the Groups '69 program .... I was always impressed by the way that the staff was constantly willing to help."*
>
> *"I felt the program was the greatest. I probably would not have made it if it wasn't for the Groups Program and people like Dean Boyd and Laverta Terry encouraging me. The supportive services you offered were one of the factors that enabled me to become a successful student."*
>
> *"The whole program was beautifully planned. It opened the gates to my future. This May I will receive a B.S. in Business, and thanks to Groups it was all possible."*
>
> *"Who over thought of this had a great idea. This is like a head start."*

"I would like to thank the Groups Program and those associated with it for giving me a chance. I probably would not have gotten to go to school if these people had not helped."

These conclusions must be tempered, of course, with the realization that our survey sample is biased in favor of the Groups Program. Doubtless, many of those who didn't return their questionnaires were disenchanted and disillusioned with their IU Groups experience. And, to be sure, there were some student criticisms of almost every aspect of the Groups Program.

The most frequent area of criticism, and of concomitant recommendations for change, was financial aid. Other areas of comment dealt with: the selection and identification of Groups students, counseling directed at early clarification of student goals and of development of a strong personal commitment to these goals, and a "get tough" policy which would keep students from getting off the track. While no single student expressed all of these views, there does seem to be a philosophic thread tying them together. It is apparently felt by many respondents that the program will be of the most benefit to the most students if Groups members are intellectually capable of college level work, develop a clear goal commitment as early as possible, and are disciplined in working toward this goal. Thus the suggestions of: 1) careful selection based on ability and commitment, 2) earlier identification (perhaps in the Junior or even Sophomore year of high school) to foster the development of such a commitment and to facilitate necessary orientation (both psychological and logistic) to membership in the program, 3) counseling directed at developing and maintaining the goal commitment and the morale and self-discipline necessary to overcome obstacles to the goal, and 4) a "get tough," "enforce rules" administrative policy to keep students from straying from their goal orientation.

There were a few comments from "minority" Groups program members (Whites and Latinos) to the effect that the program is oriented primarily toward Blacks. If this is a problem, there appears to be no easy solution. The overwhelming majority of

Groups members are Black, thus such a focus seems appropriate. Interestingly, one such "minority" student indicated that while he was at first troubled by the Black emphasis, he soon became close friends with several Black program members, and eventually came to realize that he was receiving a type of multi-cultural education.

One additional comment that seems worth consideration is the suggestion for Groups Program reunions.

> *"Group Program members should not lose contact with IU, with the Group Program, or with each other. There are several dear friends that I haven't seen in years, and I'd like to know what's happened in their lives. Reunions would not only be enjoyable and refreshing, but would act as a personal measure of each student's progress. We all need to know how far we've come."*

Along this same line several respondents suggested that current Groups students might benefit by exposure to Program "alumni."

APPENDIX

Cover Letter

Questionnaire

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - UNIVERSITY DIVISION - GROUP PROGRAM

104 MAXWELL HALL - BLOOMINGTON, IN 47401

Dear Group Student,

March 18, 1977

We are trying to improve the Group Program and we need your help. We are contacting all past and present members of the Group Program, asking for reactions to the Program, and for suggestions to improve it. The information you provide will be of great benefit to us in our evaluation efforts, and ultimately to future Group students. Please answer all items on the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope which is also enclosed.

Sincerely,

Rozelle Boyd

RB:hm
Encs.

Rozelle Boyd, Associate Dean and Director
Group Special Services

1. Please check the Group Program of which you are/were a member:
   ___ Group 69
   ___ Group 70
   ___ Group 71
   ___ Group 72
   ___ Group 73
   ___ Group 74
   ___ Group 75

2. Sex: ___ Male
   ___ Female

3. Social Security Number: _____-___-_____

4. Birth date: _____ ___ _____
   Month Day Year

5. Are you currently a student at I.U. Bloomington?
   ___ yes
   ___ no
   a. When did you leave I.U. Bloomington?
      ___ After the initial Summer Session
      ___ After the 1st semester
      ___ After the 1st (Freshman) year
      ___ After the 2nd (Sophomore) year
      ___ After the 3rd (Junior) year
      ___ After the 4th (Senior) year

   b. When you left, did you
      ___ Transfer to a regional campus of I.U.
      (Which campus? _____)
      ___ Transfer to another college or university
      (Which college or university? _____)
      ___ Graduate (Go to question 7)
      ___ Leave college altogether, before graduation

6. If you left I.U. Bloomington before graduation, have you earned a Bachelor's degree elsewhere?
   ___ yes
   Where? _____
   When? _____
   ___ no
   Do you plan to do so in the future?
   ___ yes, definitely
   ___ yes, probably
   ___ not sure
   ___ no, probably
   ___ no, definitely

7. If you have earned a Bachelor's degree
   a. What was your major? _____
   b. Have you earned a degree beyond the Bachelor's?
      ___ no
      ___ yes
      Which degree? _____
      From what school? _____

8. If you remained at I.U. Bloomington beyond your first year, did you leave the University Division (formerly called Junior Division)?
   ___ no
   ___ yes - What School did you enter?
      ___ Arts and Sciences
      ___ Education
      ___ Health, Physical Ed. & Recreation
      ___ Music
      ___ Business
      ___ Other (Specify) _____

30

9. If you are no longer in college, are you employed?
   ____ yes
   - ____ in a job related to your college preparation
   - ____ in a job not related to your college preparation

   ____ no
   - ____ because you couldn't find a job
   - ____ because you didn't want a job
   - ____ other reason (specify) _____

10. During your stay at I.U. Bloomington, where did you live each year?

	Dormitory	Fraternity or Sorority	Apartment, rented room or house	In the home of relatives or friends	Other (Specify)
Freshman	____	____	____	____	_____
Sophomore	____	____	____	____	_____
Junior	____	____	____	____	_____
Senior	____	____	____	____	_____
Graduate	____	____	____	____	_____

11. Did you receive financial aid during your 1st year at I.U.?
   - ____ yes, full aid (all educational expenses paid)
   - ____ yes, partial aid
   - ____ no

12. If you received financial aid while you were at I.U., did you receive
   a.
   - ____ Loans
   - ____ Grants (including BEOG, SEOG, State Scholarship Grant, etc.)
   - ____ Work study
   - ____ Scholarships

   b. Was the amount of financial aid you received adequate to meet your educational needs?
   - ____ yes
   - ____ no

   c. Were you satisfied with the kind of financial aid you received?
   - ____ yes
   - ____ no (Why not?) _____

13. Was your Recommender (the person from your home community who recommended you for the Group Program)
   - ____ a high school teacher
   - ____ a high school counselor
   - ____ a high school principal or vice principal
   - ____ a community project worker
   - ____ a social worker
   - ____ a person associated with the Armed Forces (Army, Navy, etc.)
   - ____ a Job Corps worker
   - ____ an Upward Bound Worker
   - ____ your employer
   - ____ other (please specify) _____

14. You and at least one of your parents were required to attend an Area Visitation Program in your home community during the Winter or Spring before you enrolled for the initial Summer Session. Which of your parents attended this program with you?
    ____ mother only
    ____ father only
    ____ both parents
    ____ other relative (specify) _____
    ____ guardian(s)

15. Was the information provided at the Area Visitation Program helpful to you?
    ____ extremely helpful
    ____ somewhat helpful
    ____ not very helpful
    ____ don't remember

    Comments:

16. Was the information provided at the Area Visitation Program: (check all that apply)
    ____ too detailed
    ____ not detailed enough
    ____ too much was covered
    ____ confusing
    ____ clear and about the right amount

    Comments:

17. Did you attend the Campus Visitation Weekend (for Group 69, the "Pre-Orientation Program")?
    ____ yes
    ____ no
    ____ don't remember

18. Was the information about I.U. and about the Group Program which was provided at the Campus Visitation Weekend (or the Pre-Orientation Program) helpful to you?
    ____ extremely helpful
    ____ somewhat helpful
    ____ not very helpful
    ____ don't remember

    Comments:

19. Were the social activities during the Campus Visitation Weekend helpful (in getting) to know other Group students, staff members, the University in general, etc.)?
    ____ extremely helpful
    ____ somewhat helpful
    ____ not very helpful
    ____ don't remember

    Comments:

20. Did you understand the purposes of the Group Program when you first enrolled?
    ____ yes, they were very clear
    ____ yes, but they were not too clear
    ____ no
    ____ I don't remember

    Comments:

21. Did you understand your obligations as a Group student when you first enrolled?
____ yes, they were very clear
____ yes, but they were not too clear
____ no
____ I don't remember

Comments:

22. Did you understand the Group Program's obligations to you when you first enrolled?
____ yes, they were very clear
____ yes, but they were not too clear
____ no
____ I don't remember

Comments:

23. Several special courses (such as J courses) have been offered at I.U. in which Group students could have enrolled. Below is a list of areas in which special courses were offered. In the blank beside each course area, please write in the number of special courses you took in that area. (e.g. 2 special courses in History.) Do not write the number of hours.

Number	Area
_____	English
_____	Speech
_____	Mathematics
_____	History
_____	Reading & Study Skills
_____	Political Science
_____	Biology
_____	Special Language courses (foreign language or Germlish)

24. Were the special courses you took helpful in preparing you for more advanced courses? (Feel free to write any comments you may have about specific courses.)
____ they were not helpful
____ they were somewhat helpful
____ they were very helpful
____ I did not take any advanced courses

Comments:

25. Did you apply to be a Student Assistant after your 1st year at I.U.?
____ yes
____ no

If yes, were you accepted?
____ yes
____ no

For Items 26 through 34 you are to make two checkmarks per item: one checkmark to indicate how much you used various facilities and resources available through the Group Program, the other checkmark to indicate how helpful each facility is/was for you.

		Amount I used				Helpfulness			
		Not at all	Once in a while	Frequently	Don't remember or Doesn't apply	Not at all	Somewhat	Very	Don't remember or Doesn't apply
26.	Reading & Study Skills Center	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
27.	Latino Cultural Center (La Casa)	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
28.	Black Culture Center	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
29.	Tutorial program of the Black Culture Center	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
30.	Individual tutoring in the Group Program office	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
31.	Personal conferences with the Group Program staff relating to personal or social concerns	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
32.	Personal conferences with the Group Program staff relating to financial concerns	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
33.	Personal conferences with the Group Program staff relating to academic concerns	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
34.	Personal conferences with the Group Program staff relating to career or vocational concerns	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

For Items 35 through 40 you are also to make two checkmarks per item: the first checkmark is to indicate how frequently you meet or met with various Group staff members, the second checkmark is to indicate how helpful each of these persons is or was to you in your student career.

		Frequency of Meetings With				Helpfulness of			
		Seldom	Once in a while	Quite Frequently	Don't remember or Doesn't apply	Not at all	Somewhat	Very	Don't remember or Doesn't apply
35.	Your Recommender - before you entered the Group Program	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
36.	Your Recommender - after you entered the Group Program (during visits home, the Recommender's Workshop, after leaving school, etc.)	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
37.	Your University Division Academic advisor	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
38.	Your Student Assistant (former Group student who assisted in the residence halls during the initial summer session)	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
39.	Your Residence Hall Assistant (graduate student in charge of a section of your residence hall during the initial summer session)	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
40.	Your Buddy (staff, faculty, or graduate student assigned to 10-12 Group students to help them through the 1st year	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

The final items in this questionnaire are designed to give you an opportunity to comment on any feelings you may have about the University and the Group Program which have not been covered in the preceding questions.

41. What aspects (services, programs, people, etc.) of the Group Program do you (or did you) particularly like? Which helped you the most in your later academic life or your chosen career?

42. What aspects of the Group Program do you (or did you) particularly dislike or find unhelpful? What changes would you recommend to improve the Group Program?